

CITY OF VANCOUVER

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

A Special Meeting of the Council of the City of Vancouver was held on Thursday, July 15, 1971, in the No. 1 Committee Room, at approximately 12:10 p.m.

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Adams in the Chair
Aldermen Bird, Hardwick, Phillips, Rankin,
Sweeney and Wilson

ABSENT: His Worship the Mayor (On Civic Business)
Alderman Broome
Alderman Calder
Alderman Linnell (On Leave)

CLERK TO THE COUNCIL: M. James

Report of Standing Committee of Council
on Planning and Development, July 15, 1971

MOVED by Alderman Bird,
SECONDED by Alderman Sweeney,
THAT the report of the Standing Committee of Council on Planning and Development of this day's date be adopted.

- CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:12 p.m.

STANDING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

JULY 15, 1971

A meeting of the Standing Committee of Council on Planning and Development was held in the No. 1 Committee Room on Thursday, July 15, 1971, at 10:20 a.m.

PRESENT: Alderman Bird, Chairman
Aldermen Adams, Hardwick, Phillips, Rankin,
Sweeney and Wilson

ABSENT: His Worship the Mayor (On Civic Business)
Alderman Broome
Alderman Calder
Alderman Linnell (On Leave)

CLERK: M. James

The Minutes of the meeting of June 17, 1971, were adopted.

PART I

The following recommendations of the Committee are submitted to Council for consideration:

I Strathcona Rehabilitation Program

The Director of Social Planning/Community Development, acting as Chairman of the Strathcona Working Committee, prefaced the report of that Committee with the following:-

"The SWC is comprised of representatives from the Province, Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation (CMHC), Strathcona Property Owners' and Tenants' Association (SPOTA) and three City officials, Director of Finance, Director of Planning and Civic Development and Director of SP/CD. Six meetings of the SWC were held in April and May to try and reach consensus on the main items of the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program still under consideration.

City Council meeting February 16, March 9 and March 30 1971 outlined conditions under which the City would participate in the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program. The SWC has reached a consensus on five program items which vary from the conditions outlined by Council and on three other items not previously dealt with by Council. They are listed by heading below:

1. Items Covered by Council Resolutions

- (1) Zoning
- (2) Grant-Loans (Amount, Conditions, Areas of Application, Retroactivity and Other Related Aspects)
- (3) Engineering Services (Degree of Improvement, Scale of Relief to Property Owners' Share of Local Improvements)
- (4) Administration (Includes Expenses for SPOTA Members and Advisors to SPOTA)
- (5) Interim Nature of the Project

2. Items Not Covered by Council Resolutions

- (1) City-owned Lands and Their Disposal
- (2) Lands Required for Public Purposes
- (3) Agreement to Implement the Program

/continued ...

Clause I Continued

Agreements have been reached in the SWC on all other items considered to date and which are to be included in the City's application to the Province and CMHC for financial assistance, under Provincial and Federal Housing Acts, to implement the proposed Strathcona Rehabilitation Program. These agreements are found in the minutes of SWC meetings, concluding with the May 29 meeting, copies of which are available. City representatives on the SWC wish to seek guidance from Council on the above eight (8) items prior to further Committee meetings."

Mr. Harry Con, President of the Strathcona Property Owners and Tenants Association, spoke to the Committee and advised of that Association's comments as follows: The Association agrees in principle with the recommendations of the Strathcona Working Committee, with the exception of -

the matter of zoning;

the matter of the grant/loan formula application and restrictions;

that the rehabilitation was undertaken with the view to a specific "lifetime" and the Association felt there should be no "lifetime".

Mr. Con also pointed out that this report did not, and the Association felt that it should, deal with the matter of the connector between the Georgia Viaduct and Highway 401, the implications of the Gastown beautification, and the matter of the relocation of Fire Hall Number 1 in the Strathcona area.

Mr. K. Ganong (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation) and Mr. J.E. Brown (Province of B.C.), who were members of the Strathcona Working Committee representing the Federal and Provincial Governments, were present and spoke to the Committee on various points as they were discussed.

Mr. Con made reference to his letter dated June 18, 1971, which suggested amendment to the grant/loan schedule, and to his letter of June 25, 1971, which commented on each of the sections reported on. Copies of both these letters were supplied to all members of the Committee.

The Board of Administration under date of July 2, 1971, submitted a report prepared by the Director of Social Planning/Community Development, the Director of Planning and Civic Development, and the City Engineer which contained eight specific areas of concern, divided into two groups as follows:-

" 1. Items Covered by Council Resolutions

- (1) Zoning
- (2) Grant-Loans (Amount, Conditions, Areas of Application, Retroactivity and Other Related Aspects)
- (3) Engineering Services (Degree of Improvement, Scale of Relief to Property Owners' Share of Local Improvements)
- (4) Administration (Includes Expenses for SPOTA Members and Advisors to SPOTA)
- (5) Interim Nature of the Project

/continued ...

STANDING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT 3
JULY 15, 1971

Clause I Continued

2. Items Not Covered by Council Resolutions

- (1) City-owned Lands and Their Disposal
- (2) Lands Required for Public Purposes
- (3) Agreement to Implement the Program"

In view of the format of the report, the Committee agreed to consider the items *seriatim* with discussion on each.

ITEMS COVERED BY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

(1) Zoning

Council previously advised the members of the Working Committee as follows:-

"No change from existing RM-3 zoning which permits a range of residential development, including conversions, and would allow owners not wishing to rehabilitate to sell at values related to this zoning; rehabilitation to extend life of buildings about 10 to 20 years as originally proposed by the Working Committee considered appropriate. However, Working Committee to report back on possibility of limiting height of apartments."

The Working Committee advised that discussions to date suggested rezoning to RT-2, which permits low-rise apartments up to 0.75 F.S.R. to ensure that new uses are compatible with the existing family environment. The Director of Planning and Civic Development orally reported that the natural redevelopment of this area, in general, would be to a level consistent with RM-3 zoning, and in the report he advised:-

"The RT-2 zoning would limit the development potential of the lands, (including 64 lots owned by the City).

An alternative could be (CD-1) Comprehensive Development District with controls generally in accordance with the (RM-3) Schedule plus a height control. This would set an effective maximum F.S.R. at about 1.4 (as compared with a maximum for high rise buildings of about 1.85), and limit the possibility of overshadowing houses retained and rehabilitated."

Your Committee discussed the matter and

RECOMMENDS, following the execution of agreements to implement the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program, that the Director of Planning and Civic Development make application for rezoning of the parts of the area, being the Strathcona Rehabilitation Study area, now zoned RM-3 medium density multiple dwelling district, to RT-2 two-family dwelling district.

(2) Grant-Loans

Council had by previous action advised of the following position on this matter:-

/continued ...

STANDING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
JULY 15, 1971 4

Clause I Continued

Council Position

(a) Amount and Conditions

Maximum grant-loan (City interest-free loan of 25%;
grant from Province 25%; and from C.M.H.C. 50%) \$3,000

Matching amount from owner (In cash \$1,000 plus
\$2,000 borrowed, possibly from C.M.H.C. at
preferential interest rate) \$3,000

Applicable to single family dwellings and conversions, for owners who
have occupied the premises for minimum of three years.

The advance by the City would be administered as a charge against the
property over a period to be determined (3 to 5 years) at no interest
(subject also to the legal position of the City permitting this).

The repayment instalments would carry the usual form of penalty and
interest for late payment or non-payment as defined by the City Charter
and By-laws.

The application of this principle to Strathcona to be considered an
experiment only, not committing the three levels of government to the
same policy for other areas.

The 75% contribution by the Federal and Provincial Governments would
be forgiven in proportion to that part of the City's share paid off
at any time. Grant fully recoverable if property sold within three years.

(b) Standards

Not set out in detail. To be generally consistent with an extended
life of buildings of 10 to 20 years.

(c) Administration

The Council's position on the administration of grants and loans and
their eligibility regulations as expressed by resolution (In Camera)
of March 9, 1971 is that it would prefer this aspect of the rehabilita-
tion project being in the hands of C.M.H.C., which has the necessary
organization. "

The Director of Social Planning/Community Development, as Chairman
of the Strathcona Working Committee, noted discussions on the
matter of grant/loans formula in the Committee, and reported the
following from the Strathcona Working Committee for your Commit-
tee's consideration:-

"Trend of Discussions in Committee to Date"

(a) Grant-loans to owners of single family and two family dwellings and
conversions whether occupied by owner or not, related to income as in
following table:

/continued ...

STANDING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
JULY 15, 1971

5

Clause I Continued

| Cost of Work \$ | Annual Income of Owner | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | \$6,000 or less | \$7,000 | \$8,000 | \$9,000 | \$10,000 or more |
| | Amount of Grant-Loan (GL) | Owner's Contribution (OC) | | | |
| 3,000(max) | 3,000(GL) Nil(OC) | 2,250(GL) 750(OC) | 1,500(GL) 1,500(OC) | 750(GL) 2,250(OC) | Nil(GL) 3,000(OC) |
| 2,000 | 2,000(GL) Nil(OC) | 1,500(GL) 500(OC) | 1,000(GL) 1,000(OC) | 500(GL) 1,500(OC) | Nil(GL) 2,000(OC) |
| 1,000 | 1,000(GL) Nil(OC) | 750(GL) 250(OC) | 500(GL) 500(OC) | 250(GL) 750(OC) | Nil(GL) 1,000(OC) |
| 500(min) | 500(GL) Nil(OC) | 375(GL) 125(OC) | 250(GL) 250(OC) | 125(GL) 375(OC) | Nil(GL) 500(OC) |
| | (GL=100%) | (GL=75%) | (GL=50%) | (GL=25%) | (GL=?) |

Income defined as:

The income of the owner for the purpose of assessing the amount of grant-loan applicable shall be gross income derived from all sources by the family head during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date of the application for a grant-loan including investment income, wages, commissions, fees, annuities, all forms of social assistance such as Canada Pension Plan benefits, Unemployment Insurance benefits, plus:

- (i) 100% of spouse's investment income or social assistance benefits;
- (ii) 50% of spouse's gross wages or earnings;
- (iii) 25% of gross income received from boarders;
- (iv) 50% of gross income received from roomers;
- (v) any other form of income which in the opinion of the Strathcona Rehabilitation Committee should be considered as income but excluding life of medical insurance benefits and family allowance benefits;
- (vi) in exceptional situations the interpretation of family income shall be determined by the Strathcona Rehabilitation Committee.

Applicable to all owners including absentee owners. For owner-occupiers, applicants required to have been in occupancy before April 1, 1971. For rented premises, increases in rent to be restricted to proven increases in operating costs. Grant-loans, less that part of the City's 25% loan already repaid, to be recoverable if property sold within five years.

- (b) Grant-Loans to owners of apartment buildings containing three or more dwelling units up to a maximum of \$1,000 per dwelling unit with no contribution required from owner. Rent increases to be restricted to proven increases in operating costs.
- (c) Grant-loans to be made available to owners who wish to demolish dilapidated buildings and construct new houses.

/continued ...

Clause I Continued

(d) Retroactivity

Work undertaken since April 1, 1970 to be considered for eligibility for grant-loans, on the basis that some owners have started work in anticipation of the program.

(e) Standards

Grant-loans only approved when the total grant-loan, plus owners contribution, is sufficient to bring the property up to acceptable standards of health and safety. For this purpose "N.H.A. Minimum Property Standards for Existing Residential Buildings" and applicable City By-laws will govern.

(f) Definition of Rehabilitation

In this program, rehabilitation shall include:

- (i) Renovation and repair to existing residential buildings.
- (ii) Demolition of sub-standard sheds, garages, fences and similar structures.
- (iii) The demolition and reconstruction of a sub-standard residential building as determined by the Committee.
- (iv) Extensions that are necessary to bring a residential building to the minimum space standards of the National Building Code.

Rehabilitation shall not include a conversion by the addition of sleeping, housekeeping, or dwelling units and/or extensions which might exceed the definition contained in (iv).

The application of a grant-loan towards demolition and reconstruction of a sub-standard building was included on the basis that this would assist in general rehabilitation of the area.

The proposed broadening of the program from the City Council's position, as indicated above, is based on the philosophy that rehabilitation should apply throughout the area and therefore all residential buildings should be considered and that the amount of the grant-loans should be related to incomes on the principle of giving greatest aid to those with lowest incomes. The restriction on rent increases is proposed to minimize hardship to low income tenants."

Mr. Ganong advised your Committee that from the date of the signing of the agreement to implement the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program, applicants would have two years to apply, and would be allowed three years from the date of their application being granted, to have the rehabilitative work done.

On the matter of grant/loans the Director of Planning and Civic Development submitted the following comments:-

The principal implications for the City are:

- (a) The City would be getting into the areas of "means tests" and "rent controls" since the City is proposed to be responsible for the administration of the project.
- (b) The application of grant-loans towards demolishing dilapidated houses and the construction of new houses could create the situation of new houses with a life expectancy of 50-60 years being encouraged in an area presently zoned, and anticipated as being redeveloped for medium-density multiple dwellings within a considerably shorter time.

/continued ..

Clause 1 Continued

Whether the principles of relating grant-loans to incomes and the consequent required income investigation, and of restriction of rent increases are accepted by the City or not, it is increasingly clear that it would be highly desirable to have this part of the rehabilitation project handled by C.M.H.C., which presently administers programs involving such matters.

The City's position on sharing of administrative costs related to grants and loans as expressed in the Council resolution of February 16, 1971 which adopted recommendations of the Standing Committee on Planning and Development of February 4, 1971 is that the City would contribute 25% of administrative costs, other than those respecting loans and grants, this being based on the Committee's recommendations that loans and grants and their administration be the responsibility of the Federal and Provincial Governments.

At its meeting on March 9, 1971 when it agreed to participating by way of 'grant-loans', the Council still expressed itself in favour of C.M.H.C. handling the administration of this aspect.

It is concluded therefore that if the City agrees to broadening the program, as indicated above, all aspects relating to the administration of grant-loans should be handled by C.M.H.C."

The Board of Administration on the topic of grant/loans commented as follows:-

" YOUR BOARD note that the very elaborate Grant-Loan system has been introduced by CMHC on the basis of need, the variations proposed being considered more equitable than the equal matching system originally proposed.

YOUR BOARD recommends strongly to Council that this only be accepted if the administration of means tests and rent controls are administered by CMHC Officials, who are familiar with this form of administration, with the cost being chargeable to the project and the City bearing their share. It is just as reasonable for CMHC to deal with this aspect of expertise in the same way that the City of Vancouver will be handling all services in the area.

YOUR BOARD further recommend that the Grant-Loan system for new houses as per Sub-section (2)(f)(iii) be not approved since it is contrary to the philosophy of Limited Rehabilitation, which the whole system was intended to introduce.

The giving of Grant-Loans to absentee landlords and for multiple dwellings has been introduced so that rehabilitation can be encouraged throughout the area.

No comment is offered on this departure from Council's previous instructions. "

Your Committee discussed this general topic at length with the representatives of S.P.O.T.A. and the two senior levels of government and

RECOMMENDS that the grant/loans formula, as shown at the foot of page 3 of the Board of Administration report dated July 2, 1971 on the subject of Strathcona Rehabilitation Program, be approved, and

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that Council advise the senior levels of government that it strongly favours the administration of grant/loans by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation on a cost sharing basis with the other partners, and

/continued ...

Clause I Continued

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that the grant/loans be not available to new owner-occupied homes or to vacant land, and

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that the following -

"and the same time limitations shall apply"

to sub. (iii) of (f) in (2) in the section of the report of the Board of Administration dated July 2, 1971 entitled 'Strathcona Rehabilitation Program' dealing with "Grant/Loans", and

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that the following be added to the second last paragraph on page 4 of the above-noted report -

"provided, however, that rehabilitation shall include such additions if, after determination by the Committee, such additions are required for the family of the owner where such dwelling is self-occupied and for family use only; under no circumstances shall any addition be allowed if it is to be used as rental accommodation."

(3) Engineering Services

It was noted that Council on March 30, 1971, accepted as a guiding principle that engineering services be improved or provided to a degree appropriate to the zoning and the anticipated extended life of the rehabilitated properties.

The Director of Social Planning/Community Development advises of the following which reflects the position of the Strathcona Working Committee:-

" The City Engineering Department gave the Committee a very rough estimate of \$2.25 million for upgrading the surface works (pavements, walks and lighting) to multiple dwelling standards and renewal of any underground services not likely to last for at least ten years. When rezoning to RT-2 was proposed, the Engineer indicated that servicing to a residential (RT-2) standard would be somewhat less costly but no estimate was given.

In view of the proposed rezoning to RT-2, and with the desire to share the total available funds among the several facets of the program, the sum of \$2.0 million was suggested to provide Engineering Services to an RT-2 Standard.

In view of the anticipated contribution of 75% of the cost of the works from the senior governments, it was considered that the property owners in Strathcona should be given 75% relief from local improvement charges (i.e. that they should pay one-quarter of what they would normally pay)."

The Director of Planning and Civic Development indicated:-

" If the area is rezoned to CD-1 as a variation on RM-3, or if rezoning to RM-3 at the end of the 10 to 20 year extended life of the existing dwellings is at all likely, then servicing to a multiple dwelling standard at this time would be advisable, especially in view of the narrow margin between the Engineer's rough estimate of \$2.25 million and the figure of \$2.0 million, which the City Engineer confirms as a rough estimate for servicing to an RT-2 standard.

In areas of Redevelopment Project 2 and in Urban Renewal Scheme 6, where the senior governments are contributing to the cost of works, the City has provided that the property owners' share of local improvements should be one-half of what it would normally be. (This is described as '50% Urban Renewal Relief'.) In adopting this relief, Council instructed that recommendations of the relief to be given in other Urban Renewal areas be brought forward.

/continued ...

Clause I Continued

Council may consider giving property owners the 75% relief favoured by the Committee on local improvements in this program. The owner of a lot with 25 foot frontage, zoned for multiple dwelling use (RM-3), would normally pay about \$60 per year for pavement and lighting or, with 75% relief, about \$15 per year. If the zoning were RT-2 the corresponding figures would be about \$25 per year, or \$6 per year with 75% relief.

Even if the proposed rezoning to RT-2 is approved, it is suggested that re-introduction of the RM-3 zoning after the 10 to 20 year extended life of the rehabilitated buildings is not unlikely. This would be well within the life of the engineering works, and therefore services should be installed to an RM-3 standard in any event."

The Board of Administration advises:-

" YOUR BOARD concurs with this conclusion and recommends servicing to an RM-3 standard, and recommends further that if the costs exceed the amount available within the rehabilitation program, the additional cost be borne by the City. The rough estimates indicate this might be in the region of \$250,000."

Your Committee discussed this aspect of the program, and

RECOMMENDS that underground works be provided to a standard appropriate for RM-3 zoning, and that surface works be referred to the Board of Administration for report back to Council, and

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that Council accept the 75% relief for property owners for local improvement charges, and that the total expended for these works not exceed \$2,000,000.

(4) Administration

Under this general heading the report dealt with three separate aspects -

1. Field office and field staff;
2. Working Committee: Expenses for S.P.O.T.A. members and advisors;
3. Staff: method of appointment.

The following is an extract from the report containing the information submitted by the Director of Planning and Civic Development, the Working Committee, and the Board of Administration:-

• Field Office and Field Staff

(1) Council Position

The Field Office and Field Staff, listed in Section 3.(1) & (2) of the Board of Administration report of March 26, 1971 are acceptable to Council, but this is understood to be subject to the staff administering grants and loans not being City employees.

(2) Trend of Discussions in Committee to Date

Field Office and Field Staff generally as noted above are acceptable with the assumption that some of the employees may be C.M.H.C. staff members assigned to the project.

/continued ...

STANDING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
JULY 15, 1971

10

Clause I Continued

(3) Implications for the City, Possible Variations, and Conclusions

Some of the implications for the City have been noted in Section 2(3) above. It has been the view of other representatives on the Committee that the field staff would assist owners through all the steps relating to the rehabilitation process, e.g. a rehabilitation counsellor would advise an owner of the general appropriateness of his rehabilitation proposals, having particular regard to the needs to bring the structure up to acceptable standards of health and safety, a financial advisor would assist in relating the owners means to the probable costs, a draftsman/cost estimator would prepare such plans and specifications needed to obtain bids for the work and rehabilitation inspector would check the property for suitability for the proposed type of rehabilitation and for adequacy of the work done.

It is concluded that if the field staff were City employees, they would be involved in the type of work described above in addition to the income investigations and rent increase investigations referred to in Section 2 (3) above. Experience has shown that it is not sound for local government to get itself into areas of advice to homeowners on property improvements and developments. As noted earlier, it is highly desirable that the administration of all aspects of the grant-loan program be administered by C.M.H.C. staff."

YOUR BOARD concurs with the conclusions of the Director of Planning and Civic Development and recommends that the cost to C.M.H.C. of this administration be charged to the project."

After discussion of this matter, your Committee

RECOMMENDS that, provided the City of Vancouver through its employees is not put in the position of advising property owners on the matters of private property and incomes, the City of Vancouver accept the views of the other representatives and the Working Committee as reported in the above extract in Section (3).

In dealing with Sub-Sections (2) Working Committee: Expenses for S.P.O.T.A. Members and Advisors, and (3) Staff: Method of Appointment, your Committee

RECOMMENDS the adoption of -

Payment of an honorarium of \$25.00 per member, up to a maximum of three, for each meeting attended, with a maximum allowance of \$3,000.00 of project funds to be allocated for this purpose.

and -

Payment of a maximum of \$100.00 per meeting for up to two professional advisors, (i.e. \$50.00 per advisor) with a maximum allowance of \$3,000.00 of project funds for this purpose.

and

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that normal procedures be followed in the appointment of City staff in this rehabilitative program.

Clause I Continued

THE FOLLOWING SECTION OF THIS REPORT DEALS WITH
THREE ITEMS REPORTED ON BY THE WORKING COMMITTEE
WHICH WERE NOT COVERED BY COUNCIL INSTRUCTIONS

1. City-owned Lands

The Committee noted that the City on September 30, 1969, withheld from sale 64 city-owned lots in the Strathcona area pending the development of a revised scheme. The Director of Planning and Civic Development in the report noted as follows:-

• Having regard to the Council's previous resolutions and the Federal Minister's insistence that there be one committee (consisting of S.P.O.T.A.; City; Province and C.M.H.C. representatives) for the Strathcona program, discussions by this Committee on the disposal of the City lands would appear to be not unreasonable. The City, however, like any other owner, would be free to dispose of its lands at the time considered most appropriate, and for the type and degree of development permitted by the By-laws. The procedure for disposal of the lands would be subject to Council approval, as for other City lands. Use of City-owned lands for other purposes, e.g. small parks must be subject to normal City procedures.

The lot dimensions are predominantly 25' x 122'. There are 22 single lots; 9 groups of 2 lots each; and 6 groups of 3 or more lots. Generally the larger parcels should be sold for multiple development. The disposal of the single lots, which can only be developed with single family dwellings, should be studied further.

It is concluded therefore that all lots should continue to be withheld from sale until it has been established whether a rehabilitation program will proceed. The Council may wish to confirm authorization to its official representative (or representatives) on the Strathcona Rehabilitation Committee to discuss the disposal and development of these lands, but the authorization for disposal of these lands at the appropriate zoning must remain with City Council. "

The Board of Administration recommended the conclusions of the Director of Planning and Civic Development. Your Committee

RECOMMENDS the adoption of the conclusion of the Director of Planning and Civic Development, with a review of this situation six months after the signing of an agreement between the four parties to implement the rehabilitation program.

2. Lands Required for Public Purposes

In connection with the lands required for public purposes in the Strathcona area, the report contained the following:-

" MacLean Park Extension

(1) City Council Position

Lots 21-38 and Lot A, Block 76, D.L. 181, half a block on the north side of Keefer Street between Heatley and Hawks Avenues have been approved by the City and Parks Board for extension of MacLean Park. This park extension is in 'Table II' of the 1971 park purchase program, and not therefore subject to acquisition at this time except for 'protective purchasing' which would be exercised if development permit applications were made.

/continued ...

Clause I Continued

(2) Trend of Discussions in Committee to Date

Oppose purchase of private property for park extension and propose discussions between S.P.O.T.A. and Park Board regarding the necessity and desirability of extending MacLean Park.

(3) Implications for the City, Possible Variations, and Conclusions

School and park needs are being reviewed as a further check on additional acreage requirements. In the meantime, it is suggested that the City might confirm its present position that it will, if necessary, exercise a 'protective purchasing' function, using City funds only.

The Council and the Park Board should be aware that if rehabilitation is permitted on this land the park extension may be delayed indefinitely. This designated park extension cannot be changed until it is clearly demonstrated that it is not required and the Council and Park Board have agreed to any change.

It is concluded therefore, that in the meantime, no applications for rehabilitation grant-loans should be accepted within this area. "

Your Committee

RECOMMENDS that any action on lands required for public purposes be deferred and the Board of Parks and Public Recreation and the Board of School Trustees be asked for comment in connection with this matter at the earliest opportunity.

Under the same general heading, "Lands Required for Public Purposes", the report contained the following on the matter of the connection of the Georgia Viaduct with Highway 401:

"Street Requirements: Connection from East End of Georgia Viaduct to Highway 401

(1) City Council Position

The connection should follow a south-easterly direction across False Creek Flats to the B.N.R. 'Cut'.

(2) Trend of Discussions in Committee to Date

Oppose the purchase of residentially developed land in the Strathcona area and use of urban renewal funds for this purpose.

(3) Implications for the City, Possible Variations, and Conclusions

Present (June) consultants' proposals show only minimal acquisition and clearance for highway purposes within the Strathcona area. The residents should be aware that every effort is being made to minimize acquisition of residential property, and that final decision is not possible at this time. (Note local representation on Committee guiding the consultants)

As for the MacLean Park extensions, applications for rehabilitation grant-loans should not be accepted in the area likely to be needed for this use."

YOUR BOARD concurs with the conclusions of the Director of Planning and Civic Development and recommend their approval by Council. "

/continued

Clause I Continued

Your Committee

RECOMMENDS that this matter be deferred and brought to Council's attention at the same time as the report expected on this matter from the consultants presently studying the alignment of this connection.

After considering the various items brought forward in the Board of Administration report dated July 2, 1971 re the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program, your Committee

RECOMMENDS that the City enter into agreements to implement this rehabilitation program as per the recommendations made in this report by your Committee, and

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that previous actions of Council on the matter of instructions or statements of policy re Strathcona rehabilitation which are inconsistent with the recommendations of this report be amended.

II Strathcona Rehabilitation Program Consultants' Claim for Pre-Contract and Post Contract Costs

Submitted to the same meeting of your Committee was a report of the Board of Administration dated July 8, 1971 on the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program - Consultants' Claim for Pre-Contract and Post Contract Costs. The report advised that Birmingham and Wood, the consultants engaged by S.P.O.T.A., had incurred certain pre-contract and post contract costs which were not discharged with the \$20,000 payment to the consultants.

Your Committee considered the matter and the comments of the Corporation Counsel and the Director of Social Planning/Community Development as Chairman of the Strathcona Working Committee, and

RECOMMENDS that this matter be referred to Council after receiving details on these pre-contract and post contract costs from the firm of Birmingham and Wood and the Board of Administration.

III Strathcona Rehabilitation Program - Legal Aspects

Under date of July 12, the Board of Administration submitted for information a report of the Corporation Counsel dealing with the legal aspects connected with the Strathcona Rehabilitation Program and in agreement.

Your Committee

RECOMMENDS that the report of the Board of Administration dated July 12, 1971, entitled "Strathcona Rehabilitation Program - Legal Aspects" be received.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:10 p.m.